SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

25th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXV, No. 5 | P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015 | © March 15, 1995

Gingrich on Research Policy, In His Own Words

House Speaker Newt Gingrich and his closest Congressional comrade, Rep. Robert Walker (R-Pa.), Chairman of the Science Committee and Vice Chairman of the Budget Committee, met with the DC Science Writers Association on March 8. By prior agreement, the discussion was limited to science and technology issues. Walker opened the meeting, while Gingrich was on the way. Following are excerpts from introductory remarks by the Congressmen and their answers to questions, transcribed and edited by SGR.

•

Walker. Let me tell you what brings Newt Gingrich and me together on some of these issues. We've been described in a couple publications—a term that I used somewhere along the line—as "techno-nuts." That comes out of a real interest in a lot of these issues. It was Newt Gingrich who some years ago ... was instrumental in putting together a group of young NASA engineers. Not the people who were working the big projects, but the young guys in the agency. And we got together and we went to a room over here on Capitol Hill, and

Geological Survey Fights Back—P. 5

Psychologist vs. Psychiatrist—P. 6

we had planned to spend a couple of hours with them, and we ended up spending most of the night with them, talking through the issue from the standpoint of: If you could do what you really wanted to do what would be the results....?

One of the things that we did ... was to sit down with futurists, people like Alvin Toffler.... and a lot of the people who were focusing on issues of the future, and sat down and talked to them, not so much gleaning only what they had as their belief about the future, but just getting some impression about what futurists were saying so that we could begin to craft political ideas and political movements in that direction. And I think that has also helped us formulate a set of technological-type policies over the last few years that now get a lot more attention since we've come to power....

The Speaker has arrived.... You have already been introduced.

Gingrich. [In a fast rhetorical start, without notes.] Thank you for that warm introduction. First of all, we use a planning model, that I think you'll find helpful as you go through all this, of vision, strategies, projects, and tactics. It's derived from Alfred Sloan and General Motors and then from George Marshall and Dwight Eisenhower and Franklin Roosevelt in World War II. So, when you're thinking about the future of science, for example, in America, it's helpful to start out with our vision of where we're going. If you go back, for example, and look at the work done right at the end of World War II, you see a group of people who came out of the war with a very clear vision of how basic research ought to be done, what the higher-education system ought to be like, and there are a whole series of reports and books that were written in that period, about a two- or three-year period, that are sort of astonishing.

Second, to a degree that I think may be beginning to sink in as the Contract [With America] keeps building momentum ... we're really serious about the scale of change we're describing. We're also trying to be pretty programmatic. And I want to make two sets of comments, one about government and the other about science....

First, the deficit-spending problem is vastly bigger than

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

The Republican Contract With America will necessitate at least a 50 percent reduction over 5 years in federal R&D funds, says Rep. George Brown (D-Calif.), former Chairman of the House Science Committee. He says the predicted cutback, twice what he forecast two weeks ago [SGR, March 1], is based on data from the Congressional Budget Office and the Treasury Department. Copies of Brown's gloomy analysis are available without charge from: tel. 202/225-6375; fax 202/225-3895; Internet: tclark@hr.house.gov

Taking his part in the Administration's resistance to dismemberment of its programs, White House Science and Technology Advisor John Gibbons put on a first-time invitational group meeting March 7 with 20 members of the science press. Gibbons accused the Republicans of indiscriminate hacking at R&D in trying to cut federal spending. He said from now on he'll meet regularly with the press.

Asked about the proposal by the Galvin Commission [SGR, Feb. 15] to "corporatize" Department of Energy labs, Gibbons termed it "not all that promising," adding that in April, he'll make recommendations to the President about the future of DOE, NASA, and DOD labs.

M.R.C. Greenwood, Associate Director for Science in the Office of Science and Technology Policy, has resigned, informing the President last month that she's returning to California to care for a friend and colleague receiving treatment for breast cancer. The first senior appointee to depart from OSTP in this Administration, Greenwood was the contact for the many grievances and hopes of the academic research community. OSTP Director Gibbons says a search is underway for a successor.

. . . How Do You Leverage Resources, Cut Waste?

(Continued from Page 1)

people realize. And when the baby boomers start to retire in the next 17 years, it becomes horrendous. We're heading toward a Mexican-style solution unless something is done. So, everything you write and everything you talk about in terms of government has to start with the notion that there's going to be a crunch coming that is horrendous. And people had better think through what are your real priorities, what's the most effective way to get things done, how do you leverage resources, and how do you minimize friction and waste?

Second, we have to become substantially more oriented to competing in the world market. You can't keep running $150-billion-dollar-a-year [trade] deficits. You can't keep putting yourself in a position where we may invent it but we don't market it, we don't build it, we don't have market share. Again, if you watch, for example, what we're doing in biotechnology, the combination of bad tax law and bad regulatory law means we are minimizing the likelihood of our dominating the market we dominate.

If you check the trend lines over the next 10 years, the odds are very high that the Germans and Japanese are going to dominate a market that we should absolutely own. But we don't have the kind of capital investment laws that encourage building the new technologies. And with the FDA, we have exactly the kind of regulations that discourage bringing products to market first in the United States. So, we are very potentially actually going to be killing the very jobs we want to be creating.

Third, we start from a premise that a centralized, bureaucratic command-and-control model is just plain wrong. And a good place to look at is NASA as an example in the space business, but we can take it across the board. The Pentagon is another good example.

All technologies have a propensity to crash and cost unless the government artificially constrains them. So, go out and look at microwaves, cellular phones, faxes—you can take any technology—laptops. Then look at technology in health care and defense. You either have to conclude that there are two remarkably arcane areas in which natural law does not work, or that, in fact, the government is artificially intervening in probable behavior in a way which makes costs higher than they ought to be. I think it's the latter.

And so, part of what Bob [Walker] and I are about is how do we liberate entrepreneurial spirits, how do we make it easy for people who are creative to go out and find the resources to create? And then how do we make it as easy as possible to create the jobs and to dominate the world market?

Let me talk now just for a second about science. Reagan captured it best in a very simple phrase: "You ain't seen nothing yet." We are in the very early stages of a transformation sufficiently massive that none of us actually even have a clue how to describe it. I'm in the process of writing a fairly controversial book right now. Most of the controversies are nonsense, but hopefully, the book will be controversial, too, and then it will sell. But, as I'm trying to outline, how do you take the revolution in materials technology; the revolution in biology which is going to lead to the age of molecular medicine; the revolution in computing capabilities; the revolution in collapsing distance by satellites and fiber optics? You can go through about 12 of these things. Now, how do you begin to explain the synergism of 2020?

One of our great problems has been in an area where, frankly, all of you can do a much, much more aggressive job of helping poor, everyday politicians like Bob and me. C.P. Snow's two cultures really does exist. The people who know about math, science, and engineering are by definition inarticulate in the common culture. The people who are really good on Donohue and Oprah by definition don't know anything about math, science, and engineering. So, if you are articulate, you're ignorant, and if you're knowledgeable, you're incapable of communicating.

So, if you're a normal person, it is very hard to get the kind of vivid portrait of the world that is just around the corner, if only we had the courage to go out and seize it and go out and do things. Part of what Bob and I are trying to work on is how do we liberate, how do we get people to think like that?

I've got two standard props I'm now using. I'll show these and then I'll quit. The President of MIT came by the other day. This is from 1989 [holding up to the audience a card about 2x2 inches]. This is an MIT micro-motor chip, which has ostensibly 70 electric motors on it. Just the little tiny thing [on the card], about one-fourth the size of a postage stamp. So that clearly, for example, open-heart surgery in 15 or 20 years could easily be just an individualized roto-rooter, where you go in as an outpatient, they put it into your leg, it runs around for a while, it comes back out, and you go home. Which, by the way, is the right way to deal with health-care costs.

[Holding up a vacuum tube.] This, many of you being sophisticated science types, will recognize instantly as a vacuum tube. And the last remaining mass purchaser of vacuum tubes on the planet is—the United States government.... When you fly home, this is running the air-traffic

(Continued on Page 3)

© 1995, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, $455.00 (two years, $780.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

. . . Another Crop of Edisons is the Gingrich Goal

(Continued from Page 2)

control system, because the federal procurement regulations are so stupid, and although I have a PhD, I don't believe in obfuscation. So, stupid is a legitimate word. The federal procurement regulations are so stupid that we cannot figure out how to replace this. And as a result, the Clinton Administration will recommend privatizing the FAA because they literally can't figure out how to do this inside the federal government. This is not good.

I teach a course, which is also controversial, called Renewing American Civilization. I spend two hours on the spirit of invention and discovery. We talk about Edison, the Wright brothers, a whole range of things. The problem we have, that is really an interesting conundrum, is by 1930, approximately one-sixth of the US economy had been invented by Thomas Edison. The Wright brothers, with a non-government experiment, succeeded while Langley was crashing a steam-catapult aircraft built at the Smithsonian into the Potomac....

The truth is we really don't have brilliant models—we have pretty good models of engineering. Once a breakthrough occurs, we can do a skunk works, we can do an Apollo project, particularly if it's a startup. We don't have particularly good models of long-term bureaucracies that don't stagnate. The truth is we're not real sure how you figure out where the next 30 Edisons are, or where a Bill Gates is. So, part of what Bob and I are wrestling with is how do we create a general climate, a general tax code, a general environment where the next 30 potential Edisons have an opportunity to invent the future with such momentum. After all, somebody who creates one-sixth of your economy is worth looking at. If you had about five of those you have a lot bigger economy. And that's what we're trying to figure out how to do.

Gingrich and Walker then took questions, compressed here by SGR for brevity.

Q. Can you suggest some specific steps to improve the FDA?

Gingrich. I've encouraged several groups to form efforts to try to design a new model. I'm a big believer in paradigms. And even though it's a joke in this city, I think [Thomas] Kuhn [author of *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*] is essentially right, in that you do get real breakthroughs that are intellectual. I think it's clear that the FCC, the FDA ... are all paper-oriented, backward-looking, and process-dominated systems that are totally obsolete for the information age. I do not have an intellectual model of replacement... But I know that's the right question. And I know that it is inexcusable for us to be, for example, setting up rules where you can't even manufacture things in the US for export, even if they're legal in the other country.

So we literally export medical jobs, and biological jobs, and biotech jobs because it's better now to build the factory in Canada or Germany, because you can import it here once it's approved, and you can manufacture it there for the rest of the world. It's illegal today to do that. As a simple step, I would say, you ought to be allowed to export American goods to any sophisticated Western country that has reasonable standards. I'm not saying you ought to go ahead and dump poison in the third world on a country that doesn't have any laws. But if Germany, Japan, Italy, and Canada make something legal, you ought to be able to manufacture in the US. You shouldn't have to place your factory in Ireland. And I think you'd be surprised if you did a survey, how many biotech and pharmaceutical jobs and medical equipment jobs have left the United States precisely because of those kind of destructive rules.

Q. Do you think the federal government should be spending less on R&D, and what kind of shifts do you want to see happen in R&D spending?

Gingrich. Walker and I are likely to go back-to-back into the Appropriations Committee in early May. I will argue that we should actually in the long run, as a proportion of total budget, spend more on R&D. But I would spend much less trying to have the US government as a, quote, partner with industry. I would also do a lot more end-result purchasing....

I've had a very good talk with [NASA Administrator] Dan Goldin. I must say, I think Goldin is one of the most innovative and entrepreneurial managers in the entire federal government. That may destroy his career, my having said that. I talked to Dan about a week ago before we did a conference over here in space. And I think he's prepared to consider out-sourcing the Shuttle, and hiring a company to run the Shuttle. I think he's prepared to consider being a customer for the second-generation Shuttle. I've asked several major aerospace firms, if the US government just said build it, don't come to any meetings, don't send your engineers to design meetings, just cut metal.... And they said it would probably take 40 percent of the time and cost one-third the government specs....

Walker. I differ only in detail, that is, I don't think the science issue is totally a federal budget issue. I've said over and over again that what I think we ought to be doing is accessing the $6-trillion economy. I want to advocate policies and bring forth policies that assure that at the end of this year, or at the end of any year, that we are spending more in totality out of that overall national economy for research than we spent before. But I don't think that is purely a government issue. In some cases, getting government out of the way will insure more spending in total in the economy. In some cases, tax policy would encourage more development.

Q. Why are environmental groups so distressed by your policies?

Gingrich. Why are they so far out of touch with mainstream America? I don't know. Go ask the environmental

(Continued on Page 4)

. . . US Biological Service a Creation of Left Wingers

(Continued from Page 3)

groups. I met last week with a group of biologists and I said the only way you can understand what's happened to environmental policy is to look at the deer population on an island that has no predators. What you had is you had a non-feedback system in which the environmental groups went further and further out of touch with normal Americans and further and further out of touch with science and further and further out of touch with economic cost-benefits. And one morning it crashed....

I believe with Rene Dubos' model that we are the caretakers of the earth. We can't avoid it. We're the dominant species. We're not particularly destructive to the earth, but we can be very destructive to the ecosystem that we're used to. The earth will abide. It will be here long after we get done messing it up. But as the dominant species, with substantial power, we have an obligation to think through the management and the care of the planet. But that is a process, not of creating some kind of automatic theistic position. It's a process of saying, what's a good cost-benefit ratio? Did Superfund work? No. We wasted at least 80 percent of the money on lawyers and bureaucracy. Has asbestos been a reasonable investment per life saved? For the same number of dollars, could you have done something else?

Walker. .... The first bill after the Contract item we passed out of this committee was a hydrogen research bill [HR 655, the Hydrogen Future Act, introduced by Walker]. It was in large part based on my belief that we ought to begin taking a look at some of these things as being synergistic rather than being antagonistic....

Q. Wouldn't the proposed elimination of the US Geological Survey and the National Biological Service reduce our ability to deal with environmental problems?

Gingrich. Let me draw a distinction. I don't think we eliminate the US Geological Survey. When I checked that, they cut out one or two programs in the Appropriations Committee as a rescission within USGS....

Walker. We cut it back in some areas where even the USGS says that probably privatization makes some sense, in the mapping service, for example. It is, in fact, a totally rational approach.

Gingrich. But that's a very important point, because what I find happening is that various groups, whether because they're partisan or ideological or just because they're an interest group, they want to protect their particular rice bowl....What happened to the Biological Survey [recently renamed the Biological Service] is simple: Everybody in the West and everybody in rural America assumes that the Biological Survey is designed by left wingers in order to create a data base so they can take over their ranch. I was just at a meeting this afternoon with a group of Westerners who said it, because I was talking about the need to finish a biological survey of the United States. They said, "Don't use that phrase. In our part of the country, it's death." Because they assume [Interior Secretary Bruce] Babbitt will use it to destroy us.

Q. [To Walker] How do you reconcile backing a government hydrogen-research program with your opposition to government trying to pick winners in the marketplace?

Walker. It is not in my view a picking of a winner or a loser to say that you are doing studies in a field that involves a very large number of questions. And hydrogen is certainly, as the most plentiful element in the universe, something that is a wide enough field, it seems to me, that maybe some research should be done. In all honesty, the idea behind the hydrogen bill is that this is an area of research at the Department of Energy where they have almost refused to do work in it over the years. We literally had to force a line item into the appropriations. It has been an item where the Department of Energy has basically ignored it for years. We are trying to reprioritize the thinking at Energy. Does it fit as pure, basic science? No. But we tried to write the bill in a way that assures the research will be done in fundamental generic areas rather than toward any particular type of commercialization. I happen to think that does fit very much in the direction that we're trying to take the Committee.

Q. Isn't that what the Advanced Technology Program [ATP] is trying to do?

Walker. I fundamentally disagree. Most of the ATP programs and so on, much of what they're trying to do is develop particular commercial products by the end of it. That is not generic research. That is very much applied research, and there the government is certainly, as a matter of contract, picking winners and losers. I just think that is bad policy.

Q. The Administration says it's generic research.

Walker. That's what they say. I don't think the track record is quite that clear. And while they can certainly show some places where they are supporting generic technology, in other cases what they're doing is replacing money that would be spent in streams of industrial research with government money. And I don't think that's an appropriate use of government research dollars.

Q. With your goals of cutting taxes and balancing the budget, what will government research look like in 2002?

Gingrich. You can get to a balanced budget by 2002 with a consistent $30-to-$40-billion-dollar-a-year increase in total federal spending.... You just need to understand, you have an enormous momentum of a big system. We start at a trillion, five-hundred and sixty-five billion dollars annually, and then we add money. That means over a seven year period, you can talk in terms of 10 or 11 or 12 trillion dollars in spending. So, people start saying, "Oh, my God, they're going to get to a balanced budget. We won't have anything left to spend." You'd think that if you could organize and get your act together, that at around 12 trillion dollars over a seven-year period, you could get a fair amount done....

I want to suggest, you're going to see a tremendous

(Continued on Page 5)

. . . Chairman Walker Doubtful About Future of OTA

(Continued from Page 4)

transformation. Everything in this system is on the table, except Social Security. Everything ought to be looked at. Every agency, every Department. My personal guess is we will be at least four departments smaller by the time we're done.... [Gingrich departed at this point.]

Walker. There is a proposal that we have being drafted that would anticipate a Department of Science. When you talk about a mega-department, it would not include all science. For instance, NIH is not amongst the ones that would be pulled in. But we're looking at this in large part because if you anticipate, as we are now beginning to anticipate, that the Department of Energy and the Department of Commerce would be included in the cuts of the four departments that the Speaker just spoke of, there are large pieces of science research that are in those departments...

Then you also, if you take a look at the National Science Foundation, NASA, EPA, and several other agencies that do a significant portion of science around town, you can put together a Department of Science that has a fairly broad agenda and saves you considerable money with a cut of about 5000 personnel.... One of the things I'm very sensitive to is ... if you have a mega-science department, you also end up with a kind of a science czar who then has some domination over government policies. That's the reason why I will tell you that I also then believe that you have to look at science in terms of the totality of the economy, so that not all science is being done at government direction. Because if you're going to put together a Science Department, you'd better have other options available to you in the university community, the industrial community, and other places.

Q. *What do you see in the future for the Office of Technology Assessment?*

Walker. I think the Office of Technology Assessment is in real trouble with the Appropriations Committees. I mean, it started in the Senate, when the Senate made it pretty clear that they were not for it. And my understanding, from talking to the appropriators, is that it probably will not survive the next cut, in terms of being reformulated for next year.

In my view, the Office of Technology Assessment has done a pretty decent job in some areas, in long-term studies. But the problem is it is a legislative entity that does not do a very good job of sticking to a legislative rhythm. And as a result, sometimes when we needed information from them that fit with the legislative discussions under way, they were not able to produce that kind of information on a timely manner. They like to work on at least 18-month cycles, and many times on two- and three-year cycles. The problem with that is that's sometimes a full election away, and it doesn't necessarily fit with the way we do things on Capitol Hill. And so, while they have served the broader community well, in terms of information I've received, there is a real question about whether or not they have had a complete fit as a legislative agency.

Geological Survey Warns Of Earthquake Menace

It was Geophysical Terror Day on Capitol Hill last week as chiefs of the US Geological Survey (USGS), facing the Republican budget ax, told bug-eyed Senators of the catastrophes lurking beneath the surface of their states.

Tectonic studies indicate that Seattle could be hit by a colossal earthquake, USGS Director Gordon Eaton told the Chairman of the agency's Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, Slade Gorton, Republican of Washington. Could be a chart-busting nine on the Richter Scale, Eaton suggested. The annual earthquake bill across the US, he said, is about $5 billion. "Earthquakes are not simply a California problem," he remarked.

Staring at a USGS poster map on which the Pacific Northwest was shaded red to indicate the highest seismic activity, Gorton asked if that meant a "potential for the greatest earthquake?" Director Eaton deferred to his earthquake man, John R. Filson, Acting Chief of the Survey's Geologic Division, who answered in the affirmative, though pointing out that such an event could be expected "on the order of once every thousand years." Gorton appeared a bit relieved, but Eaton swiftly turned to another menace, pointing out that 14 active volcanoes are bubbling away in the Pacific Northwest. The Geological Survey, he told the Chairman, maintains an interdisciplinary watch in the area, with specialists in geology, water, and mapping. "If the USGS is dismembered," he argued, "we'd lose the synergism."

Earlier in the hearing, Senator Ted Stevens, Republican of Alaska, noted that his state ranks high in volcanoes and rumbling earth, and described himself as dumbfounded by proposals to terminate or even substantially cut back the Survey. But that will happen "over my dead body," he vowed.

Senator Pete Domenici, Republican of New Mexico, expressed concern about the aquifer on which his parched state depends. Noting studies that indicate that the water supply is both smaller and being used faster than was previously thought, Domenici asked Eaton if the Survey would study the problem. Responding that he would be pleased to do so, Eaton noted that the New Mexico water problem requires the skills of the Survey's geologic and hydrologic specialists. There is no assurance that they would retain their vitality, or even survive, under various privatization and reorganization proposals for the Survey, he warned.

Under the lash of the Clinton Administration's downsizing drive, USGS reports staff reductions of 10.6 percent, or 1130 employes, since January 1994. The budget request for next year is $586 million, a touch above this year's figure, but $10 below the 1994 budget. The Survey has trimmed down substantially, Eaton told his Senate appropriators, and is

(Continued on Page 6)

Psychologist, Psychiatrist Clash on Training Program

The psychologist sounds hurt and the psychiatrist appears to be blowing his top in a high-ranking exchange of letters concerning therapeutic turf in the cruel world of health-care frugality.

This particular clash between the long-warring professions was ignited by a snotty column by Jerry Wiener, MD, President of the American Psychiatric Association, in the January 6 issue of *Psychiatric News*, hometown newspaper of the 39,400-member Association, which is limited to MD shrinks. At issue was a Congressionally mandated Pentagon program to train military psychologists to prescribe medication—a task that the psychiatrists deem hopelessly beyond their capacity. The psychiatrists say that the Rasputin behind the misbegotten scheme is Patrick DeLeon, PhD, a psychologist on the staff of Senator Daniel Inouye (D-Hawaii), who chaired the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee prior to the Republican takeover. DeLeon is also a Director of the American Psychological Association, a little league of professional pretenders, in the view of the psychiatrists.

Stating in his column that "It is time to revisit 'old adversaries': managed care and psychology prescribing privileges," Wiener wrote that "since clinical psychologists largely abandoned psychological testing, which was their only unique skill, they are left only with psychotherapy, of whatever ilk."

The president of the psychiatrists' association then cited "the remarkable perception that learning how to write prescriptions will eliminate the distinction between psychologists and physicians, and of course eliminate the nonexistent shortage of prescription writers in the military."

Wiener's January column elicited a pained reply from Jack G. Wiggins Jr., PhD, former President of the American Psychological Association, which numbers 132,000 members. Published in the March 3 issue of *Psychiatric News*, Wiggins's letter accused Wiener of breaking a cease fire between the associations—an "agreement of mutual civility which leaders of the two APAs arrived at on December 12, 1991." He also accused Wiener of "an unnecessarily personal attack on Dr. Patrick H. DeLeon, and, by implication, Senator Daniel Inouye." The psychologist's letter was followed by a reply from psychiatrist Wiener, which stated:

"I don't criticize Dr. DeLeon on any personal basis, only on his being the author, instigator, promoter, and ultimately indirect beneficiary of a wasteful, unneeded, unrequested, and expensive program, doing so through the instrument of Senator Inouye's previous subcommittee chairmanship and totally at the expense of taxpayers, and furthermore utilizing service personnel (and now their dependents) as subjects in this experiment, all without their informed consent."

Wiener continued: "Does not your Association have any qualms about such a program, which in addition to all the above is intended to benefit the military little if at all, but is instead clearly using the power of the public's purse to set in motion and establish a precedent for use in pushing for psychologist prescribing at the state level? It is your organization which should feel apologetic at such an activity."

Noting that DeLeon holds office in the American Psychological Association, Wiener also raised the issue of conflict of interest, stating that DeLeon's "first obligation is to the public and not to his professional association."

"In addition," psychiatrist Wiener's letter went on, "my remarks pale in comparison to remarks made by Dr. DeLeon and others of your Association regarding psychiatry and psychiatrists." As for the "agreement of mutual civility" cited in the psychologist's letter, Wiener declared, "I did not participate in the agreement you cite of December 12, 1991, and do not consider myself a party to it..."

In SGR's view, the participants in this controversy could benefit from counseling.—DSG

USGS *(Continued from Page 5)*

working on additional economies.

Chairman Gorton focused on what could be split off from the Survey without impairing its unique functions. Eaton suggested that some, but not all, mapping services conducted by the Survey might be privatized. But research and monitoring activities should be left intact, he insisted. As a non-regulatory agency with a strong scientific tradition, the Survey commands wide respect, he pointed out, adding that dismemberment and dispersal to the private sector and other government agencies would be a false economy.

At the conclusion of the hearing, Senator Gorton appeared to be persuaded. Summing up, he told Eaton, "You have strong support from Senator Stevens and implicit support from Senator Domenici, and I join with them."

Elimination of the Survey is a pet scheme of Rep. John Kasich, Republican of Ohio, Chairman of the House Budget Committee. The wipe-out plan is often misidentified as part of the House Republicans' Contract With America. But the Survey shows up only on a list of budget-cutting options compiled last year by Kasich's Budget Committee staff, post-election but before they moved up to majority status on the Committee when the new Congress convened.

Earlier last year, Kasich introduced the so-called Kasich Budget, in which, among numerous proposals, he blithely disassembled the Geological Survey, as follows: "The basic research functions would be assumed by the National Science Foundation. Mapping would be eliminated, since that can be provided by either private operators or the Department of Defense when national security is involved. The federal-state cooperative program of the water division would be eliminated, since states can buy water studies from private consultants. EPA would assume any necessary role in stream monitoring."

The House, currently in a feeding frenzy against the federal establishment, might easily accept that bizarre scenario as workable. The Senate, however, is showing signs of cautious selectivity in its cutting decisions.—DSG

In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

From the General Accounting Office (GAO), no charge:

University Research: Effects of Indirect Cost Revisions and Options for Future Changes (GAO/RCED-95-74; 28 pp., no charge), unrelated to the changes in indirect-cost rates proposed by the Clinton Administration (*Federal Register*, February 6), this report looks at the effects of earlier revisions. The 1991 cap of 26 percent on administrative costs took $104 million out of the hide of academe, the GAO found. Prior to the change, 29 of the 140 universities in the survey had rates over 60 percent; in the present fiscal year, the over-60s amounted to 19 percent. The report says it's still too early to assess the effects of 1993 changes that put remission of graduate student tuition in the category of direct costs, but the GAO notes gloomy forecasts of the effects on graduate enrollments. Changes proposed by the Clinton Administration, for which comments are due by April 7, are expected to knock another $200 million or so off indirect-cost payments.

Federal Research: Interim Report on the Small Business Innovation Research Program (GAO/RCED-95-59; 34 pp.), says the quality of research proposals appears to be holding up in the recently expanded program, founded in 1982, to provide support for small R&D firms. But with total annual funding approaching the billion-dollar mark, problems have arisen, the GAO reports: "According to agency officials, a few companies received funding for the same proposals twice, three times, and even five times before agencies became aware of the duplication." The GAO notes stiff competition for the awards, which range from $100,000 for starters to $750,000 for a full-scale project. The Air Force, it says, deemed 1174 proposals worthy of support in 1993, but funded only 470.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

From the National Academy of Sciences:

The Changing Nature of Telecommunications/Information Infrastructure (230 pp., $27, plus $4.50 for shipping), two dozen papers and discussion summaries from a workshop held in October 1993 by the Academy's Computer Science and Telecommunications Board, chaired by William Wulf, University of Virginia. George L. Turin, of the Teknekron Corporation, chaired the steering committee.

Order from: National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20055; tel. 1/800-624-6242; in the Washington, DC, area: 202/334-3313.

From the National Institutes of Health:

NIH Peer Review Notes (quarterly, 10 pp., no charge), a publication of the NIH Division of Research Grants (DRG), manager of the NIH peer-review system, with reports on numbers of applications, success rates, ground-rule changes, published studies of peer review, and other items in the grants derby. An account of an introspective meeting in September of the Biological and Physiological Sciences Review Section says the group concluded that "the general health of the peer review system is quite good..." Cited as the big need was more money—scarce and likely to become more so. Over the past five years, the DRG reports, the number of competing applications reviewed rose by 12 percent and total direct costs requested for the first year increased from $1.5 billion to $2.1 billion.

Order from: NIH Peer Review Notes, Grants Information Office, Division of Research Grants, NIH, Westwood Building, Room 449, Bethesda, Md. 20892; tel. 301/594-7248; fax 301/594-7384.

From the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA):

Health Care Technology and Its Assessment in Eight Countries (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01402-5; 368 pp., $23), reports on methods used to evaluate new health-care equipment and techniques in the US, Australia, Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the UK. OTA concludes that the US is ahead in both the introduction and assessment of new technologies, but notes, too, in an announcement of the publication, that "technology assessment has had relatively little overall impact on the diffusion of medical technology in the United States." (A four-page summary is available without charge: tel. 202/224-8996.)

Tools for Evaluating Health Technologies: Five Background Papers (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01404-1; 149 pp., $11), papers on "Evaluating Medical Outcomes Through Patients' Records," "Large Administrative Database Analysis," "Large and Simple Randomized Trials," "Meta-analysis," and "Clinical-Economic Trials."

Order from: Superintendent of Documents, PO Box 371954, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15250-7974; tel. 202/512-1800; fax 202/512-2250. For instructions for electronically accessing OTA reports: OTA Telecommunications and Information Systems Office: tel. 202/228-6000; e-mail: sysop@ota.gov

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, $455.00 ☐
two years, $780.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, $35.00 per year; non-USA surface mail, $15.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill
Please charge to: ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# _____ Exp.date _____

_____
Signature

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

From the White House:

Second to None: Preserving America's Military Advantage Through Dual-Use Technology (51 pp., no charge), a sales pitch that arrived as House Republicans were voting last month for burial of one of the Clinton Administration's major R&D initiatives—the Technology Reinvestment Project, which spreads matching Pentagon money to research projects presumed to hold both military and commercial potential. The genesis of so-called dual-use research goes back to the Bush Administration, but the big growth, to about $500 million a year, began under Clinton. The dual-use concept is justified, the report argues, because many technologies are "being driven by fast-growing commercial demand, not by miltary demand." Contending that it's really pork-driven, House Republicans voted to abolish TRP. The Senate Appropriations Committee took a merciful approach, merely reducing the program by $200 million—a halfway move that the fiery House is not likely to accept. Meanwhile, over 100 high-tech industrial firms, big and small, have organized a TRP rescue effort under the title of the Coalition for Technology Partnerships, headquartered in Washington (tel. 202/638-4434). The *Second to None* report bears the label of the National Economic Council, the National Security Council, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Order from: National Economic Council, Old Executive Office Building, Room 233, Washington, DC 20500; tel. 202/456-6630; fax 202/456-2223.

From the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST):

NIST Industrial Impacts: A Sampling of Successful Partnerships (80 pp., no charge), first published last September, this one has recently been in evidence on Capitol Hill in defense of another Clinton R&D favorite under severe attack, NIST's Advanced Technology Program (ATP), which shares costs with industrial firms and consortia interested in common projects with commercial potential. The House recently took back $107 million from the $431 million in NIST's current budget. The House Appropriations Committee then took another $46 million from other industrial-aid programs and NIST's own laboratory funds. Still to come: Senate action, but decisions taken there so far are aimed at more modest rescissions. *Industrial Impacts* consists mainly of reports on experiences that some 60 firms have had with NIST programs—all favorable.

Order from: NIST, Public Affairs Division, SP 872, Gaithersburg, Md. 20899-0001; tel. 301/975-2762; fax 301/926-1630.

(Continued on Page 7)

From the Science Policy Research Division of the Congressional Research Service, part of the Library of Congress, all at no charge:

High-Energy Physics Research: Description and Issues (95-210 S; 34 pp.), reviews the battered state of particle physics following the Super Collider debacle, with emphasis on spending proposals for keeping the US in the game, as formulated last year by a panel chaired by Professor Sidney Drell, of Stanford University. In the past, the report observes, the field commanded sufficient political support, despite remoteness from practical applications. But it cautions that Washington's budget-cutting drive "may mean that Congress will require that federally funded basic research be more closely focused on the near- to mid-term." The report is by Daniel Morgan and Richard Rowberg.

The Defense Science and Technology Strategy (95-185 SPR; 6 pp.), ranges over the major issues of defense R&D, noting the Pentagon's turn to dual-use technologies, while Congress is increasingly skeptical about projects that lack visible military relevance. On another front, the report shows that in real terms, DOD support of basic research declined from $1.3 billion in fiscal 1993 to $1.2 billion in the present fiscal year, 1995. According to the DOD's research chief, the report adds, about 10 percent of last year's funds went to programs of questionable military relevance, including breast-cancer research (mandated by Congress), parts of the dual-use program, and manufacturing technology. Kurt F. McPherson and Richard M. Nunno wrote the report.

The US Geological Survey (USGS): Its Mission and Its Future(?) (95-145 SPR; 6 pp.), cites Republican proposals to abolish the Survey (see P. 6) and distribute its parts to the private sector, NSF, EPA, and Defense. The report takes no position on this wacky proposal, but strongly hints at doubts, including whether funding would be assured for the USGS seismic network and volcano observatories. James E. Mielke wrote this one.

The High Performance Computing and Communications (HPCC) Program: An Introduction (95-272 SPR; 6 pp.), a primer on the origins and components of Washington's big push in computer-related technologies, funded this year at $1.15 billion, with about the same amount requested by the White House for next year. The report observes that doubts have arisen in influential quarters about the government's ability to make wise choices in this fast-paced field. "Critics contend," it points out, "that even after recent reports and criticisms, the HPCC is still too large, lacks proper focus, and emphasizes the wrong technologies." The report was written by James J. McLoughlin.

Order these reports through a House or Senate member. Senate switchboard, 202/224-3121; House, 202/225-3121. Cite the Congressional Research Service as the source, with report title and number.